REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-16 are pending in the application. Of these, claims 9 and 16 are being amended for cosmetic reasons to remove "that" before "having". The amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification and original claims and add no new matter. Entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the present case is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

1. Objection to Claims 9-11 and 16

The Examiner rejected claims 9-11 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner objected to the language "according to color selected from a color code table that having a list of colors and associated process chamber kits", on grounds that the color table does not appear to be part of the transportation package but rather used by the manufacturer during processing of the container.

However, claims 9 and 16 are to a transportation package in which at least a portion of the first or second tray is colored according to a color selected from a color code table. Applicant submits that the underlined language "in which at least a portion of the first or second tray is colored" denotes structure, namely a portion of a tray, having a selected color. The portion of the tray structure that is colored is part of the package and is a structural limitation, thus, these claims are not indefinite, and the color table itself is not being claimed.

It should also be noted that claims 9 and 16 are being amended for cosmetic reasons to remove "that" before "having" although this does not have any bearing on the Examiner's rejection.

2. Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the Drawings on grounds that the color code table having colors and associated process chamber kits must be shown in the drawings or these features canceled from the claims.

As explained Applicant is not intending to claim a color code table, as suggested by the Examiner, but rather a tray that is colored, i.e., a tray which has a color - as opposed to an uncolored tray. The claimed tray is shown and described and in the present application.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that while the color code table is mentioned in the claims, it is not necessary for the understanding of the invention, because the table is simply a written list of spelled out colors, for example, red, blue, green, etc. and chamber components that can be arbitrarily associated with each color. The color code table with its list of colors and associated components can be easily created by one of ordinary skill in the art for any given chamber component list, by arbitrarily associating a particular color with a particular chamber component, and without any undue experimentation.

Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 6 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Barth et al. (US 3,487,921).

Claim 1 recites, inter alia, a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit having a plurality of differently shaped chamber components. The package comprises first and second detachable rigid trays which have a plurality of conformal cells having different internal surface profiles formed by facing pairs of first and second troughs, the internal surface profile of each conformal cell matching an external surface profile of a chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation.

Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a quick connect coupling which allows viewing and inspection of the coupling thorough the container. Barth et al. further teaches that a single coupling is placed inside the container. Thus, Barth et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of differently shaped chamber components. Barth et al. also does not recognize the advantages of using the claimed transportation package in a clean room environment.

Furthermore, Barth et al. does not teach a package comprising rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each has an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Instead Barth et al. teaches a container for a single component and not a plurality of components. As taught in the instant Specification, a process chamber kit has a number of different components. It is difficult to track all the components of a single kit after a kit is dismantled from a chamber. The present packaging with different shaped conformal cells allows maintaining all the components of the kit together in a single

package which has different cells to conform to different chamber component shapes. A package with a plurality of conformal cells that each has an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component is not shown or disclosed by Barth et al.

Thus, Barth et al. does not teach each and every element of claim 1, and consequently, Barth et al. does not anticipate claim 1.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

1. The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Barth et al, in view of Everson (US 5,454,478).

As explained above, Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a single quick connect coupling which allows viewing and inspection of the coupling thorough the container. Barth et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit having different conformal cells for a plurality of different shaped chamber components as claimed in parent claim 1. Nor does Barth et al. recognize the advantages of using the claimed transportation package in a clean room environment for packaging for a process chamber kit having a plurality of differently shaped chamber components.

Also, Barth et al. does not teach a package comprising rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each has an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Instead Barth et al. teaches a container for a single component and not a plurality of components.

Everson does not make up for the deficiencies of Barth et al. because Everson also does not teach a package comprising rigid trays having conformal cells

that each have an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Instead Everson discloses a compartmentalized transferred container comprising generally rectangular storage compartments. The generally rectangular storage compartments are not conformal cells having an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component, as claimed in claim 1.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Barth et al. does not disclose handle portions. Everson discloses a recessed cavity 26 into which a separate structure of a handle 24 is fitted, as shown in FIG. 1 and described at column 4, lines 8-12. In contrast, claim 4 is directed to "a handle cut-out" which is a cut-out section that serves as the handle itself, that is, it does not have a separate handle structure.

Thus, neither Barth et al. nor Everson disclose the features of parent claim 1 or the claimed handle cut-out of claim 4, and thus, this rejection should be withdrawn.

2. The Examiner rejected claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over the references applied above with respect to claims 4, further in view of Keip et al. (US 5,816,425).

As explained above, neither Barth et al. nor Everson teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in parent claim 1. Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a single quick connect coupling and Everson discloses a compartmentalized transferred container comprising generally rectangular storage compartments. Neither reference teaches a package comprising rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each has an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Neither Barth et al. nor Everson teach the advantages of the claimed transportation package in

a clean room environment for packaging for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of differently shaped chamber components.

Furthermore, as acknowledged by the Examiner, Barth et al. does not disclose handle portions. Everson discloses a recessed cavity 26 into which a separate handle 24 is fitted, and does not disclose "a handle cut-out" which is a cut-out section that serves as the handle itself.

Keip et al. discloses a modular parts container that includes multiple side panels having interlocking end fittings. (Abstract.) However, Keip et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit having different conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in parent claim 1. Keip et al. appears to teach a container having a single box shaped enclosed space. As shown in FIG. 1, and not different conformal cells as claimed. Nor does Keip et al. teach or suggest the advantages of using the claimed transportation package in a clean room environment for packaging for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of differently shaped chamber components. Keip et al. also does not teach rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each has an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Thus, the combination of Keip et al., Barth et al. and Everson does not render claim 5 obvious.

3. The Examiner rejected claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Barth et al. in view of Hamilton et al. (US 4,674,650).

Claim 7 is dependent on claim 1, and further recites a groove in the rim of a tray and a gasket seal within the groove.

Barth et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in parent claim 1. Instead, Barth et al. teaches a transparent

container for a single quick connect coupling which allows viewing and inspection of the coupling thorough the container. Barth et al. does not recognize the advantages of a clean room package having rigid trays that define a plurality of conformal cells that each have an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation.

The Examiner acknowledges that Barth et al. does not disclose a gasket seal with a groove. Hamilton et al. teaches a container and a cover fastening means for shipping resins, such as polytetrafluoroethylene resin. (Column 1, lines 18-21). However, Hamilton et al. does not teach a package for use in a clean room environment which comprises rigid trays that each define a plurality of conformal cells, each cell having an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Instead, Hamilton et al. discloses a single cell container for holding liquid resins as shown in FIG. 1.

Thus, the combination of Hamilton et al. and Barth et al. do not teach or suggest claim 7.

4. The Examiner rejected claims 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Barth et al, in view of Official Notice.

Barth et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package comprising rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each have an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component as claimed in parent claim 1. Instead, Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a single quick connect coupling. Barth et al. does not recognize the advantages of the claimed container. Furthermore, coloring a container for aesthetic purposes as suggested in the Official Notice taken by the Examiner, is not the same as the claimed feature of a container having a tray that has a color selected from a color code table

which associates particular colors with particular chamber components. The advantages of a color coded container, namely to allow ready identification of chamber components without opening a sealed packaged is not the same as selecting a color based on coloring aesthetics. A container color from a color code table for chamber components is not obvious from general color tastes and preferences.

Thus, the instant claims 9-11 are not obvious over Barth et al. and the Examiner's Official Notice.

5. The Examiner rejected claims 12-13 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over Barth et al, in view of Hamilton et al. (US 4,674,650).

Barth et al. does not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit which has a plurality of conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in claim 12, and claims 13 and 15 which are dependent therefrom. Instead, Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a single quick connect coupling. Barth et al. does not recognize the advantages of a package for a clean room environment which comprises rigid trays defining a plurality of conformal cells that each have an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation.

Furthermore, the Examiner acknowledges that Barth et al. does not disclose a gasket seal with a groove.

Hamilton et al. teaches a container and a cover fastening means for shipping resins, such as polytetrafluoroethylene resin. (Column 1, lines 18-21). However, Hamilton et al. does not teach a package for use in a clean room environment which comprises rigid trays defining conformal cells having an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during

transportation. Instead, Hamilton et al. discloses a single cell container for holding liquid resins as shown in FIG. 1.

Thus, the combination of Hamilton et al. and Barth et al. do not teach or suggest claim 12 or the claims dependent therefrom.

6. The Examiner rejected claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over the references applied above with respect to claims 13, further in view of Everson (US 5,454,478).

As explained above, Barth et al., Everson and Hamilton et al. do not teach a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in claim 12. Barth et al. teaches a transparent container for a single quick connect coupling and Everson discloses a compartmentalized transferred container comprising generally rectangular storage compartments. Hamilton et al. teaches a container for shipping liquid resins. Neither Barth et al. nor Everson nor Hamilton et al. recognize the advantages of a transportation package for packaging a process chamber kit having a plurality of differently shaped chamber components. The cited references also do not teach a package comprising rigid trays that each define a plurality of conformal cells, each cell having an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation.

Thus, the cited references do not render claim 14 obvious.

7. The Examiner rejected claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), as being unpatentable over the references applied above with respect to claims 12, further in view of Official Notice.

Barth et al., Everson and Hamilton et al., do not teach a package comprising rigid trays that each define a plurality of conformal cells, each cell having an internal surface profile matching an external surface profile of a particular chamber component so that movement of the chamber component in its conformal cell is minimized during transportation. Nor do the cited references teach the advantages of a clean room transportation package for a process chamber kit that has a plurality of conformal cells for different shaped chamber components as claimed in claim 12. Barth et al. teaches a container for a single coupling; Everson discloses a compartmentalized transferred container comprising generally rectangular storage compartments; and Hamilton et al. teaches a container for shipping liquid resins. None of these cited references recognize the advantages of a transportation package for packaging a process chamber kit having a plurality of differently shaped chamber components.

Furthermore, as explained above, coloring a container for aesthetic purposes as suggested in the Official Notice, is not the same as a container having a color that is selected from a color code table which associates particular colors with particular chamber components. The advantages of color coding a container to identify chamber components safely inside a package is not determinable by selecting a color based on coloring aesthetics. Thus, the cited references do not render a claim 16 obvious.

CONCLUSION

The above-discussed amendments are believed to place the present application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the above remarks, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
JANAH & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

Date: September 21, 2005 By: _____

Ashok Janah
Reg. No. 37,487

AKJ/clh

Please direct all telephone calls to: Ashok K. Janah at (415) 538-1555.

Please continue to send correspondence to:

Patent Department, M/S 2061
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.
P.O. Box 450A
Santa Clara, California 95052.

S:\CLIENT\APPLIED\PCKG\8550\AMEND.001.doc